7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1
Middle East M1

are being steadily removed in most Middle East countries at the present time) do not obtrude very much into everyday *living* in the average household, though they may do so somewhat more among the Muslims than among the Christians. Furthermore, he believes that that bugaboo of American feminists, the female chattel, has been unusual in any culture at any time except under special, hence conspicuous, circumstances. The occurrence of such circumstances can be safely predicted only in individual families in a patrilineal system, which are so well off that the woman can be relieved of all useful functions except sex. It is only in such families that extensive polygyny (if the culture permits it) is ordinarily to be found, and certainly an unfavored wife in a wealthy polygynous household can even be deprived of the dignity of her sexual role.

In the Middle East village, however, the basic unit of everyday living is the single household. Among the Christians, it is always based on a permanent monogamous marriage, and the probability is that the same is true among the great majority of the Muslims. The very existence of the household, initially and as time goes on, depends upon the active participation of the wife. She is cook, laundress, seamstress, nurse, and, above all, mother of the children who, it is hoped, will project the honor of the family into the future. She is *sitt al-bayt*, "mistress of the house," a title which, in Munṣif, used to be given to quite a number of baby girls as their personal name. Such a woman is no chattel, and there are numerous women in the village who, as individuals, are accorded unqualified respect by all.

The average village-dwelling woman works hard and makes no pretense of "hiding her age." She will continue to work hard until decrepitude overtakes her. One occasionally may even see an old woman trudging along bent nearly double under the weight of a bundle of firewood sometimes nearly as large as herself. But if this woman is socially oppressed, it is the incessant physical labor enjoined by necessity which is the tyrant and not the hard-heartedness of her husband, her brothers, or her sons, who are as hardworking and work-worn as she is.

As has been noted, the great majority of the Munṣif women are housewives or apprentice housewives. Domestic duties occupy most of their time, but, as will be seen in the next chapter, their regular chores do not prohibit social interaction outside the house. Before the introduction of convenient and relatively inexpensive Western manufactures, the average housewife wove the cloth with which she made her family's clothes. Weaving, like shoemaking, has now completely disappeared from the village which is not exceptional in this respect (cf. Kohn, 1936, p. 269). A few housewives do ornamental needlework to supplement the family income (cf. Fisher, 1950, pp. 208–09). The forty-four village women who have non-domestic paying jobs certainly represent something entirely new in the village culture. But the jobs themselves are something entirely new, and the writer is unable to say whether or not the women's taking them is in general motivated primarily by necessity rather than by "career girl" ambitions. His impression is that most of the girls feel that their jobs are temporary arrangements before mar-

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

KINSHIP STRUCTURE AND MARRIAGE PATTERNS

THE INVISIBLE SKELETON OF THE COMMUNITY

THE LINEAGES

613
614
621

IN the chapter "Population" the kinship structure of the village was discussed in a preliminary way. It was pointed out that everyone in the Core Group except those in the Affiliate Families, is patrilineally descended from the founder of the village. Most are also matrilaterally descended from him. These descendants are divided into three so-called Maximal Lineages which at the present time appear to have little more than genealogical significance. Membership in a given maximal lineage is based on patrilineal descent from one of the three sons of the founder. These three brothers were the founders of the three maximal lineages. Each maximal lineage is subdivided into a number of so-called Minimal Lineages which are of unequal size and generational depth. Membership in a minimal lineage is, again, based upon patrilineal descent from its founder, and the name of the founder is the name of the lineage. The names of the minimal lineages are the "family" names which the villagers give when they are required to in acculturative situations outside the village. Among such situations are the filling out of government forms like identity cards, school and college registrations, and so forth. Traditionally, family, or lineage, names were rarely used in the village itself for personal identification, and this remains true today. Every individual, male or female, has his own name to which he adds his father's which, by rule, is always different from his own. (In Munṣif, there is only one exception to this rule, and in this case the birth and naming of the child after his father occurred in Australia.) Thus, if Jurjis is the son of Ḥanna, he is known as Jurjis Ḥanna. In principle, this usage is exactly the same as that of the Bedawin who would call him Jurjis ibn Ḥanna. In Munṣif, the ibn ("son of") is omitted, but it is certainly understood.

613
551

Theoretically, Jurjis Ḥanna, if asked, could complete the naming of himself by adding his grandfather's and great-grandfather's names, and so on, until he came to the name of the founder of his minimal lineage, and this name is the name of his lineage. In practice, the intermediary steps are omitted, and he would give, if required, his own, his father's and his lineage-founder's name (cf. Tannous, 1942, p. 234). Occasionally a man will be known by his own and his *mother's*, rather than his father's, name as a second name. Such cases are considered idio-

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

syncratic, and are usually due to some such fact as the death of the father in his son's infancy. After she is married, a woman continues to be known by her own and her father's names, but if she is asked to give a family name, she will give her husband's rather than her father's, family name (cf. Granqvist, 1950, p. 39).

The minimal lineages, then, are name groups. Each lineage name identifies its various bearers as members of a common descent group who are, *ipso facto*, relatives. When pressed, everyone who was asked admitted that he was also related to all the members of his maximal lineage, "and of course *all* of us in Munṣif return (*nirjiʿ*) to Manṣur Jurjis al-Khuri." Of these two wider connections, the latter, wider one seemed to be the stronger. In fact, many young adults were quite vague as to the maximal lineage affiliation of many of the minimal lineages. To put the matter in another way, it appears that in many cases a stronger identification is felt with the village as a kin group than with the maximal lineages. Even here, the writer would suggest that the sense of village identification is based possibly more on the interests of common residence than on the kinship bond of common descent from a very remote ancestor. At this point, the possibility must be raised that common descent from Manṣur Jurjis al-Khuri and the various descent patterns indicated in Table 8 and Figure 5 are partially or wholly fictional. As it is, it can be seen that the ultimate descent of Minimal Lineages XX and XXI are unknown or in dispute. But if it is fiction, it is nonetheless a significant symbol of the conceptual unity of the village, a conception which is put in terms of kinship. A basically similar concept is held by the people of Ramallah in regard to their genealogical origins (Zarour, 1953, p. 432).

Returning to the minimal lineages, we have seen that they identify by name people who are considered to be relatives. Several people said that the only relatives "who count" are the members of one's minimal lineage. In addition to this, however, matrilateral first cousins appear to count about equally as relatives. Discussion of this exception to patrilineal emphasis must be postponed till later in this chapter.

If, for our immediate purposes, lineage-mates are the only relatives who count, what do they count for? In a negative function, lineage-mates are people who should not marry each other. There is no strict rule about this, and marriages within minimal lineages do occur. They are, in fact, significantly numerous in lineage VIII, which is by far the largest lineage in the village (see Table 10). Having said this much, it must nevertheless be emphasized that marriages within a minimal lineage appear to be avoided in general. They could be much more frequent than they are without violation of the definite rule against the marriage of first cousins. In a positive function, lineage-mates may inherit from each other, whereas matrilateral relatives, no matter how close they may be, can never do so.

It cannot be said definitely that the minimal lineages have any more functions than those which have just been outlined. There are, apparently, no lineage heads, and if lineages ever act as units on any issue, no such behavior was observed or re-

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

[page 111 is a figure]

593
613 The exceptions, which are relatively recent, are sufficient to have obliterated most
621 minimal lineage clusterings.

It is quite evident that brothers are expected and honor-bound to help each
593 other throughout life, and very frequently they cooperate in business or other enterprises. Many of the remittances from emigrants appear to be based on the brother-brother relationship. The situation may be in part similar to that reported from India by Mandelbaum (1948, p. 137), in which it is now rare for extended families to remain unified after the death of the parents.

596 If this material can be interpreted as sufficient evidence of the "presence of the extended family" in Munṣif, this writer has no objection, but he himself is not entirely convinced. In part, to be sure, the problem is a terminological one, for the common usage is to equate "extended family" with "patriarchal family." The latter can only be rare or, in individual cases, of fairly short duration in a culture like that of Munṣif in which, owing to the general lateness of marriage, a man is not likely to become a patriarch over sons and grandchildren until he is rather near death's door. The family organization in Munṣif is possibly similar to that of the Chinese *chia* (Fei, 1939, p. 29).

NAMING PATTERNS

551 Related to the matter of lineages and families is that of personal names. Something has already been said about naming patterns, but more should be mentioned about the names themselves. Particular names do not seem to run in certain patrilines despite the reported ideal of naming the eldest son after his paternal grandfather (cf. Granqvist, 1950, p. 13). The names of the men are more conservative and less variable than the names of the women. There were one hundred and eighteen different male names recorded as against one hundred and forty-six different female names. Only eight of the male names (involving nine persons from five different conjugal families) are of recent foreign origin, whereas there are twenty-three female names of this type (involving thirty-one persons from twenty-seven conjugal families). The remainder of the female names are Arabic nouns and adjectives which generally have no religious significance. The most popular are Layla (Night), twelve examples; Munah, seven; Nabiiha, Fariidi, Badr, and Sa'ada, five each. Most of male names are also Arabic nouns or adjectives, but thirteen of them (involving sixty-five persons) are specifically Christian and/or of Greek origin. Nearly ten per cent of all the males in the village are named Jurjis (George). The other most popular male names are Na'iim, ten examples; Ilyaas (Elijah), Mukhail or Michel, and Fu?ad, nine each; Ḥanna (John), eight; Iliia (also Elijah), seven; Wadii', six; and Nakhli, five.

In eleven conjugal families the names of the children form some sort of rhyming or alliterative pattern. For example:

7[See preceding 3 pages -- Analyst]

16: Gulick E-5 (1952)1954 ME1 Lebanon ME1

be of any help. Then there was the flat statement that the shrines were no longer used at all. The most interesting comment was that many people still believed in the efficacy of the shrines but that they would probably deny it if they were asked because they had heard that such beliefs were a mark of ignorance. Actually, there was clear evidence that candles and olive oil are regularly burned as offerings at the shrines, but by how large a proportion of the people was not ascertained. In any case there is no doubt that there are now fundamental differences among the villagers on a matter which would not have been the subject of any disagreement 75 years ago.

In other aspects of life, religion plays a vigorous role. There are three types of occasion — weddings, and especially funerals and Easter — when all the villagers who are living away are strongly obligated to return to the village for the ceremonies. There is absolutely no question about this matter, in theory or in practice. The ritual occasions all have, of course, the same latent function, which is the intensification of group loyalty and solidarity sentiments. It can be argued that the prime motives behind these events which account for their vigor are not, strictly speaking, religious. Be that as it may, religious behavior is an integral part of the observances.

Kinship Organization. It appears that the kinship organization of al-Munsif has been the least affected by change of all the major aspects of the culture. It is often very difficult for modern Americans, in whose own culture kinship groups are of minimum importance, to comprehend the fact that in most other parts of the world kinship is one of the strongest elements in social organization. When we speak of the kinship organization of an Arab village, such as al-Munsif, we are not referring to a genealogical abstraction; we are referring, in fact, to the social organization itself. For the social organization — a pattern of interrelated statuses and roles — is defined in terms of kinship.

The unity of al-Munsif is enhanced by the fact that the villagers believe themselves all to be descended from a common ancestor who was the founder of the village. Whatever other differences there may develop among them, they continue to maintain this conception of themselves as a group. The founder had three sons among whom he divided equally the land of the community. For some time, the descendants of each of the three sons held land only in the areas originally apportioned. Each group, or lineage, also sponsored and developed one of the saint's shrines located in its territory. Eventually, the three original lineages were divided into what is now a total of 21 lineages. The name of each lineage is that of the man who is recognized as having been the common ancestor of all the members, but among the villagers themselves these lineage (or "family") names are rarely used. Their chief use is in filling out government and other official forms. A person is ordinarily designated by his own and his father's names only. Traditionally, the father's name is never given to any of his sons, and there is

Middle East MI
7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

L 551

Fu'ad
Fahiim
Fawzi
Faadi

or,

Na'iimi
Na'iim
Nabiih
Naahi
Nabiiha

or this, the most elaborate,

Rafiiq
Shafiiq
Samiir
Muniir
'amad
Ziyad
Munah

Informants said of this, as they said of some other types of behavior, "There is no rule; it is just a custom." For the most part, their attitude seemed to be that it was just a pretty notion which some people put into effect. One wonders, however, if it is not significant, at the implicit level, of two important cultural patterns: (1) the fascination with the sound of words, and (2) the concept of siblings as a solid unit rather than merely a collection of individuals who happen to have the same parents.

L 181 593

Teknonymy, a well-recognized item in Arab culture, is used to a considerable extent in the village, particularly by younger people who are referring to or addressing their elders. In such situations a teknonymous appellation is the only alternative to a kinship term (see Part Two).

L 551 601

KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

The most recent and concise statement of the Arabic kinship system is by Davies (1949). In the paper cited, the author lists and very briefly discusses the systems of kinship terminology used by a Palestinian Christian and a Syrian Muslim. The two systems are essentially the same, though there are a few substantive differences. The system used in Munṣif is almost identical with Davies' Palestinian Christian system, there being between them only a few dialectical differences which need not be discussed here. Since this material is so readily available, it is not necessary to reproduce here a complete paradigm of the terminological system. This section will, instead, consist of comments upon some facts and opinions stated by Davies and some original statements as well. The purpose is to elucidate certain problems which study of the Arabic kinship system raises, and, in so doing, to carry forward the discussion of patterns of kinship behavior in Munṣif.

L 601 ME 601

16:Gulick E-5 (1952)1954 ME1 Lebanon ME1

only one exception to this rule in al-Munsif. In this case, the son was born while the family was living in Australia.

Special formal titles are addressed to no one except the priest, the mayor, the school teachers, and the doctor. Otherwise, personal names and kinship terms are used. It is significant that when a villager addresses another who is definitely his senior, he never under any circumstances uses the Arabic equivalents of "Mr." or "Mrs." To do this would be a grave insult, for it would imply that the person addressed is considered to be a stranger and an outsider. "Paternal uncle" or "aunt" are the kinship terms most commonly used in such cases (which include the address of one's father- and mother-in-law), although the well-known teknonymous formula (for example, "Abu 'Abdallah"—"father of 'Abdallah") is often employed. (It can also be used in a joking sense, but there is never any confusion in this matter.)

Space does not allow any further elaboration on the intricacies of the system of kinship terms which is used in al-Munsif. It can be said here only that these terms—which are verbal symbols of status and role—encompass the entire pattern of reciprocal obligations, social distance, and social nearness which regulates interpersonal relations in the village. Over all, there is the abiding concept of everyone in the village being related. This is symbolized best, perhaps, by the extensive use of the term *sihr*. The basic meaning of this word is a man who has married a member of one's immediate family; in other words, a sister's or a daughter's husband. But the term is extended to any man (of same age or younger) who is married to a member of one's lineage, and it is applied to an outsider who has married any village girl. Conceptually, the outsider becomes an in-law of the entire community.

The lineages function as units of identification by name (if necessary), as units for the automatic support and aid of individual members on a reciprocal basis, and to some extent for the regulation of marriage. Marriage to a member of another lineage is preferred, provided the spouse is a member of the village. There are exceptions to this, but as a whole, the network of marriage ties—which become blood ties through women in the generations following the marriage—between the lineages is very complex. Thus the potential exclusiveness of each lineage is minimized for the benefit of village solidarity. There are, indeed, factions and cliques within the village, but its basic unity is never lost sight of.

The Arabs are often thought of as actually living their daily lives in large, extended family groups. This is not, and apparently never has been, true in al-Munsif. All the households, with one exception, consist of what sociologists call "nuclear" families. That is, they are composed, basically, of only the parents and the immature or unmarried children. But the resemblance to the typical American family ends at this point, for though

17: Tannous S, G-5 (ca. 1947-48) 1949 MEI Lebanon MEI

by the people, and ordained by higher religious authorities. Through unspecified donations, members of the community meet his needs. In some cases, he does not even cease to be an active farmer. A balance is established between the central religious organization of the country and the village church through respect for local autonomy.

Another pillar of life among the rural people of Lebanon is the family organization, which is characterized by three functional units or stages. The first of these is the primary biological unit, consisting of the married couple and their children. The second is a more comprehensive unit, known as the joint family, which consists of the grandparents at the head, their unmarried daughters, and the various families of their sons. At a certain point in its growth, this joint family breaks up into new units, resulting ultimately in the development of the largest family organization, the kinship group. Members of this group claim descent from the same ancestor and normally carry his name.

Evidences of the importance of the family organization are numerous and convincing. A village consists actually of a community of people held together to a large extent by blood ties, either through descent within the kinship group or through intermarriage between these units. Practically everybody is related directly or indirectly to everybody else. A strong sense of belonging and of solidarity develops as a result. Marriage, to a large extent, is a family affair, with emphasis upon the interests and welfare of the two family groups concerned. Children are usually named after ancestors or other relatives, thus emphasizing the blood tie. Land is normally held and operated jointly by various members of the unit. Loyalty to the family in times of crisis is binding; family honor and prestige must be upheld.

In their use of proverbs, expressing fundamental attitudes, the village folk frequently refer to this family relationship. "Blood can never turn into water." "A boy is two-thirds the image of his uncle." "Marry the daughter of a good family, though she be an old maid." "He who has no family backing has no backbone." These are but a few examples. Further evidence of the identification of the individual with the family group is supplied by the manner in which people are addressed or introduced.

17: Tannous S, G-5 (ca. 1947-48)1949 ME1 Lebanon ME1

Parents, after the birth of their first son, cease to be addressed by their given names. They are now addressed by the name of their son, as the father or the mother of so-and-so. On the other hand, the members of the younger generation, until they are married, are referred to and introduced as the children of so-and-so, of such-and-such a family.

An outstanding characteristic of this rural family organization is that, with minor exceptions in certain parts of Lebanon, the woman occupies a relatively high status. Moslem or Christian, she does not submit to the veil, nor does she suffer from undue segregation. In the majority of cases, boys and girls attend the same village school. Whenever both men and women do farm work, we find, as a general rule, that division of labor prevails, with the lighter tasks assigned to women. In many villages of the mountain region, an increasing proportion of women do not do any farm work at all, applying themselves completely to home-making. Some fifty years ago the doors of higher education were opened to the village women of Lebanon. Since then they have played an increasingly important role in national leadership and development as teachers, writers, doctors, lawyers, and enlightened homemakers.

Recreational activity, to one degree or another, is characteristic of many rural societies. This seems to be an essential need, biologically and socially, of human group life. By this means the group gives spontaneous expression, in symbolic form, to the fundamental values of its life and to its aspirations. The rural society of Lebanon is outstanding in this respect, having developed a rich recreational heritage that is well known in the Arabic-speaking world. Some aspects of this heritage have been carried to, and kept alive in, foreign countries by Lebanese emigrants. The Lebanese farmer is characterized by a well-developed sense of humor and a lively tendency to indulge in pranks. He loves to compose folk poetry and sing folk songs, when alone working in his fields or when in the company of friends. From his early childhood he learns to be a good folk dancer. At the same time his community life is characterized by an abundance of recreational expression.

Occasions for community festivities and group-play activity